

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application. Claims 1-54 were pending in the application. Claim 47 has been amended. No claims have been canceled.

Applicant has amended the specification to add cross-references to two related applications, one of which has issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,518,724, issued from entitled "WALL SWITCH DEVICE AND POWER OUTLET DEVICE." Applicant will submit art cited in these two applications in an IDS, with the exception of the Ito reference, which was already cited during the prosecution of U.S. Patent No. 6,518,724.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-22, 24-27, 29-41, 43-49, and 51-54 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,329,787; hereinafter, "Ito") in view of Blackman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,010,228; hereinafter, "Blackman"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Ito discloses a traditional docking device that allows a portable game or other device to be docked. The dock uses a standard cord that is plugged into the wall at a wall socket. There is no other mention or teaching of a wall socket except in this capacity. The Examiner relies on Blackman for teaching a wall socket.

The Background section of this application (pg. 2) sets forth the following:

... However, the need to plug each cradle into an AC power outlet limits the location of the cradles to the location of the AC outlets, and increases the amount of exposed AC wiring. For homes in particular, excess exposed AC wires are inconvenient, unsightly, and dangerous.

Therefore, what is needed is a system or method to incorporate these portable electronic devices in locations around the home or other buildings that are convenient and relatively invisible to the user. In addition, what is needed are new devices, conveniently located around a

home or other building that serve to provide the same type of uses to a user as a PDA or computer, but are effectively invisible and convenient to the user. Finally, what is needed is a ubiquitously located device for recharging web-pads and PDAs without exposed AC power wires. (emphasis added).

Thus, the present application sets forth that a problem in the prior art is increased exposed AC wiring and that the present invention solves the problem by making such AC wiring essentially invisible to the user.

The Examiner believes that one skilled in the art would look to the teachings of Ito and Blackman to arrive at the present invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Since Ito only discloses the traditional dock with a fully exposed power cord to plug into an AC socket, Applicant respectfully submits that one skilled in the art would not look to Ito for any teaching. Ito is clearly not directed toward the problems that the present invention is directly towards.

Furthermore, the device disclosed in Blackman is a wireless emergency safety light (Blackman, abstract). Blackman does not disclose or suggest any motivation to combine the wireless emergency safety light with a device docking apparatus. However, the Examiner argued in the Office Action that "it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to employ the teaching of Blackman in the system of Ito for breaking or opening an electric circuit or to divert current from one conductor to another also for charging a battery and transceiving data signal from other remote devices." (Office Action, p.3, paragraph 4). Applicant respectfully submits that the emergency safety light in Blackman and the device docking apparatus claimed are in two distinct and unrelated fields, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to look into Blackman for a solution to the problem faced by Applicant.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that one skilled in the art would not look to the teachings of Ito and Blackman to arrive at the present

invention as claimed, and thus, claim 1 is patentable over Ito in view of Blackman.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 adds a limitation that a data transceiver on the device docking apparatus to allow the device docking apparatus **to send and receive data via power wires** coupled to the AC power input. In contrast, neither Ito nor Blackman discloses such a limitation.

Ito discloses an apparatus to transmit data via a tuner (Ito, Figure 1, reference 51) by extracting data from a television wave received by an antenna (Ito, Figure 1, reference numeral 42; col. 5, lines 19-23). The other apparatus disclosed by Ito uses a modem (Ito, Figure 5, reference numeral 151) having an external input/output terminal connected to a circuit (Ito, Figure 5, reference numeral 141), such as a public circuit, by a cable (Ito, Figure 5, reference numeral 140) and a modular connector (Ito, Figure 5, reference numeral 147; col. 9, lines 13-21). The third apparatus disclosed in Ito uses only the tuner and the modem to transmit data (Ito, Figure 8). Moreover, all the apparatuses disclosed in Ito have separate power wires and data transmission lines (Ito, Figure 1, reference numerals 40 and 46; Figure 5, reference numerals 140 and 46; Figure 8, reference numerals 140, 40, and 46). Therefore, Ito does not disclose, suggest, or imply sending and receiving data via power wires.

Likewise, Blackman also fails to disclose sending and receiving data via power wires. According to Blackman, the emergency safety light (10) includes an antenna sensing device 82 for sensing the loss of electrical power, a noise filter 84 for filtering out extraneous electrical signals, and a logic gate 85 for amplifying the signal transmitted from the noise filter 84 (Blackman, col. 4, lines 14-23). The emergency safety light (10) does not send or receive data via power wires.

Since neither Ito nor Blackman disclose sending and receiving data via power wires, which is set forth in claim 2, a combination of Ito and Blackman does not render

claim 2 obvious for at least this reason. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 21 includes this same feature. Claim 47 has been amended and includes a similar feature. Applicant respectfully submits that for the same as set forth above, the present invention as claimed in Claims 21 and 47 are in condition of allowance.

Claims 3, 5-8, and 10-19 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, and therefore, are patentable over Ito in view of Blackman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, claim 20 as amended is patentable over Ito in view of Blackman. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

Claims 22, 24-27, and 29-38 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 20. For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 20, claims 21-22, 24-27, and 29-38 are patentable over Ito in view of Blackman. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections.

For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, claims 39-41 and 43-46 are patentable over Ito in view of Blackman. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections.

For at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1, claims 47-49 and 51-54 as amended are patentable over Ito in view of Blackman. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4, 9, 23, 28, 42, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito in view of Blackman and Dunn et al. (U.S. 5,625,877; hereinafter, "Dunn"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 2, claims 4, 9, 23, 28, 42, and 50 are patentable over Ito in view of Dunn because Dunn does not

make up the deficiencies of Ito and Blackman. In addition to, or as an alternative to, the above reasons, claims 4, 9, 23, 28, 42, and 50 are patentable over Ito in view of Blackman and Dunn for at least the following reason.


Dunn is directed to allowing a user of a mobile communication radio to be allocated wireless variable bandwidth on demand by aggregating available air-link communication channels (Dunn, col. 1, lines 6-13), which is unrelated to the present invention as claimed in claims 4, 9, 23, 28, 42, and 50. Dunn does not disclose or suggest using a device docking apparatus to transmit data to or from the Internet. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine Dunn with Ito to solve the problem the Applicant faced with. For at least this reason, claims 4, 9, 23, 28, 42, and 50 are not obvious over Ito in view of Dunn. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection has been overcome by the remarks and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Applicant submits that claims 1-54 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account
No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP


Dated: 7/16, 2004



Michael J. Mallie
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 36,591

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited
with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with
sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to the
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA
22313-1450 on July 16, 2004



~~Esther L. Campbell~~ 1/16/04 7/16/04
Alma Goldschain Date